REMARKS

5

In response to the Office Action mailed August 9, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-9 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended. As a result, claims 1-9 are pending for examination with claims 1 being independent. No new matter has been added.

I. Overview of Embodiments of the Invention

One embodiment described in the application is directed to a system for transmitting data using light emitters and light detectors to enable fast, stable, and secure communication. In this embodiment, a first communication device is provided with an emitter and an anti-scattering lens and is rotatable around an axis (Page 16, paragraph 3). A second communication device comprises a light detector and is stationary. The two devices are spaced very close to one another such that light emitted from the first device can be read by the second device at a high rate (Id.) The rotation of the first device creates variations in amplitude in the signal such that the second device must provide for the emitter being moved, rotated, or oscillated during communication, which is accomplished in some embodiments with a second lens (Page 17, paragraph 2). Embodiments of the invention also comprise an electromagnetic coupler to transmit power from the stationary second device to the rotating first device (Page 32, paragraph 2).

The foregoing summary is provided solely for the convenience of the Examiner. It should be appreciated that each of the independent claims may not be limited in the manner described in the summary above. Therefore, the Examiner is requested not to rely upon the summary for determining whether each of the claims distinguishes over the prior art of record, but to do so based solely on the language of the claims themselves and the arguments presented below.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP08-212501 ("Kazufumi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,356 ("Jewell"), claim 2 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kazufumi in view of Jewell and U.S. Patent No. 4,753,506 ("Einhorn"), claim 3 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kazufumi in

Application No. 10/629528
Amendment dated November _____, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2006

view of Jewell and U.S. Patent No. 5,469,423 ("Shinoda"), and claim 8 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kazufumi in view of Jewell and Japanese Patent No. JP05-135305. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to clearly point out the distinctions between Kazufumi and the present application.

6

Kazufumi discloses a method and system for generating a signal with a high signal-to-noise ratio in a video tape recorder (Paragraph 1). In a VTR, a contact-less mode of transmission is necessary because the magnetic head reads data off while rotating (Paragraph 3). Many modes of wireless transmission are subject to very small S/N ratios because of the noise generated by the magnetic reading process. Kazufumi overcomes this limitation by using optical transmission to achieve a higher S/N (Paragraph 6). Power is supplied to the rotating head in one of two ways, either by an electrical supply brush or by a solar battery (Paragraph 12; Paragraph 17)

Jewell discloses a lens for minimizing signal losses due to scattering and reflection and able to control the wavelength emitted from the lens. This is accomplished through an intra-cavity lens having a specific distance between the interfaces of layers that have both oxidized and non-oxidized areas (Col. 8, lines 16-18). This distance/thickness, in the preferred embodiments, will not be wider than half of the wavelength of the light expected to pass through it (Col. 8, lines 57-59). In order to response the effects of a given layer, the lens may have more layers than just two, but there must be an even number of layers for optimal functionality (Col. 9, lines 3-6).

Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to an optical proximity spatial transmission system for transmitting information data optically through a local space. The system comprises: a first communication device having at least one of a first light emitter or a first photodetector installed thereon; a second communication device having installed thereon at least one of a second photodetector which detects light from the first light emitter or a second light emitter which emits light toward the first photodetector; an anti-scattering lens disposed either behind the first or second light emitter or in front of the first or second photodetector; an electromagnetic coupler adapted to transfer power between said first communication device and said second communication device; and wherein the first communication device being rotatable

Application No. 10/629528
Amendment dated November ______, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2006

around an axis thereof aligned with an optical axis of at least one of light outgoing from the first light emitter or light incident upon the first photodetector while the second communication device is fixed on the optical axis.

7

The combination of Kazufumi and Jewell does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Specifically, neither Kazufumi nor Jewell discloses transferring power between two devices in communication with one another using an electromagnetic coupler. Kazufumi describes that power could be transferred between its devices by either an electric supply brush in contact with both devices or by a solar battery placed on the rotating head but nowhere even remotely suggests use of an electromagnetic coupler. Jewell does not disclose anything related to power transfer. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Kazufumi in view of Jewell and is in allowable condition.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-9 under \$103 as allegedly being obvious over Kazufumi in view of Jewell be withdrawn.

III. General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. Applicants do not, however, necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2006

8

Docket No.: S1459.70055US00

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment set forth in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Furthermore, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify any concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent. Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 2, 2006

Registration No.: 35,986

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Rough J. Pritter

Federal Reserve Plaza 600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

(617) 646-8000